

IV. REMARKS

1. **Drawings.** Applicant has submitted replacement sheets responsive to the examiner's objection to the drawings by attaching the replacement sheets to this amendment.
2. **Specification.** Applicant has amended the specification responsive to the examiner's objections.
3. **Claim objections.** Applicant has amended the claims responsive to the examiner's objections, or has otherwise amended the claims to render the objection moot.
4. **Claim rejections 35 USC 101.** The examiner objected to the claims 1-22, 28, 32, and 34-40 because the claims "are not directed to a practical application of the 101 judicial exception producing a result tied to the real world." Applicant has amended the claims to respond to the examiner's rejection.
5. **Claim rejections 35 USC 102.** The examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-24, 26-35, and 37-40 as being anticipated by Curtis (US 6,442,754). Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out the claimed subject matter. In particular, applicant has amended each independent claim to include a limitation that conflicts are identified by accessing metadata from the data structure regarding the components to be installed and by accessing data regarding the components previously installed and analyzing the meta data to determine conflicts. Curtis does not disclose determination of conflicts. Curtis states: "Block 530 represents the beginning of a loop to generate a list from the information maintained in the description ("desc") field 434 of all returned dependency objects to display to the user, indicating dependent components that must be installed before the depending program may be installed." (12:27-32). Moreover, Curtis addresses the problem of installing a single program using dependency objects, but does not address a system and method for analyzing multiple programs for pre-deployment analysis in order to streamline the deployment by parallel and group processing. Thus Curtis does not identify applications previously installed, but rather only checks for dependency objects related

to the single installation of an application ((10: 60-65) and for the operating system on which the application is being installed. (11:20-22)

6. Claim rejections 35 USC 103. The examiner rejected claims 5,25, and 36 as being unpatentable over Curtis and Bourke-Dunphy et al. (US 6,918,112). Applicant submits that these claims now depend from allowable independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2650
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-231-4703
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com